

Appl. No. 10/784,485
Amdt. dated May 20, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 21, 2008

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings are submitted. These sheets are formal drawings that replace the informal drawings of record.¹

Attachment: Eleven (11) Replacement Sheets

¹ Applicant notes that these newly submitted drawings are formal drawings. These formal drawings were submitted in the parent case. Applicant is submitting these formal drawings to make sure that these formal drawings are also of record in the present case.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008 (hereinafter, "Office Action"), claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully respond to the Office Action.

I. Claims 1-15 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,074,434 to Cole et al. (hereinafter, "Cole") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,045 to Lieu et al. (hereinafter, "Lieu"), and alternatively over Cole in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,274 to Lindgren (hereinafter, "Lindgren"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The factual inquiries that are relevant in the determination of obviousness are determining the scope and contents of the prior art, ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue, resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art, and evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, at **4-5 (2007) (citing Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references "must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2142. Moreover, the analysis in support of an obviousness rejection "should be made explicit." KSR, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, at **37. "[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." Id. (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims at issue are patentably distinct from the cited references. The cited references do not teach or suggest all of the subject matter in these claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "the adapter is a handheld device that comprises a single-board." Cole, alone or in combination with Lieu and Lindgren, does not teach or suggest this

subject matter. Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants' specification, for example, page 10, line 7 – page 11, line 3 and Figures 7 – 12.²

The Office Action points to reference numeral 14 in Figure 2 of Cole to support the assertion that "Cole teaches a communications adapter". (See Office Action, page 4.) Reference numeral 14 in Figure 2 of Cole is referred to as a client. (See Cole, col. 3, line 18.) A client, as taught by Cole, does not teach or suggest that "the adapter is a handheld device that comprises a single-board." Instead, Cole states "each of the clients 14-16 comprises a personal computer." (Cole, col. 3, line 23.) A personal computer (PC) does not comprise a handheld device that comprises a single-board. In fact, Applicant cannot find any suggestion in Cole of a handheld device with a single board.

The Office Action also asserts that "Lieu teaches an adapter." (Office Action, page 5.) The Office Action points to reference numeral 201 in Figure 2 of Lieu to support this assertion. (Id.) Reference numeral 201 of Figure 2 is a "computer." (Lieu, col. 4, line 25.) Lieu states "computer 201 advantageously also comprises: a keyboard, a pointing device for a graphical user interface (e.g., a mouse, a touchpad, etc.) . . . a speaker, and a microphone." (Lieu, col. 4, lines 33-36.) Lieu does not teach or suggest that the computer 201 is a handheld device that comprises a single-board.

In addition, the Office Action asserts that "Lindgren teaches an adapter." (Office Action, page 5.) The Office Action points to reference numeral 100 in Figure 1 of Lindgren to support this assertion. (Id.) Reference numeral 10 of Figure 1 is a computer system that "typically includes at least one data input device, e.g., a keyboard 20, used to input new or revised calendar data, a central processor unit ("CPU") 30, and memory 40...." (See Lindgren, col. 2, line 33-38.) The computer 10 taught in Lindgren does not teach or suggest is a handheld device that comprises a single-board.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1

² The following two excerpts illustrate that support for this amendment is found throughout the specifications. See e.g., page 10, line 11 ("A portable and handheld adapter 126 is shown in Figure 7"); page 10, line 28-29 ("More specifically, Figure 11 illustrates a top cross-sectional view of a handheld adapter 126. This cross-sectional view illustrates the positions of the single-board computer 130...").

be withdrawn because Cole, alone or in combination with Lieu or Lindgren, does not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 1.

Claims 2-7 depend directly from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 13 and 15 have been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claims 8, 13 and 15 are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8, 13 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 8 and claim 14 depends directly from claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9-12 and 14 be withdrawn.

II. Drawings

Applicant has submitted substitute drawings. The substitute drawings submitted herewith are formal drawings that replace the informal drawings of record.

Appl. No. 10/784,485
Amdt. dated May 20, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 21, 2008

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



/Wesley L. Austin/

Wesley L. Austin
Reg. No. 42,273
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: May 20, 2008

MADSON & AUSTIN
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 537-1700

Appl. No. 10/784,485
Amtd. dated May 20, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 21, 2008

APPENDIX

(Eleven (11) sheets of replacement drawings: Formal drawings for Figures 1-12.)